

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/878,272	TANAKA, YOSHINORI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mark R. Milia	2622	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Mark R. Milia. (3) Kevin McGoff.  
 (2) Joseph R. Pokrzywa. (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 24 August 2005.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Outa et al., Linjo, Arakawa


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Discussed motivation to combine Puta, Kinjo And ARAKAWA. Applicant disagrees with the reason for motivation. The use of ARAKAWA in disclosing detection of a line graphic was discussed as Applicant feels ARAKAWA does not disclose this feature. Examiner disagrees but is willing to reconsider the arguments presented by the Applicant.